DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 498 UD 009 665

AUTHOR Havighurst, Robert J.
TITLE Public Education for Disadvantaged Urban Minorities.
PUB DATE Nov 69
NOTE 23p.; Opening lecture of a series entitled "Urban Education--Another Look" sponsored by Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization, Community Involvement, Cultural Factors, Curriculum Design, *Disadvantaged Youth, Educational Improvement, *Educational Planning, Elementary Education, Minority Group Children, Preschool Programs, *Public School Systems, Relevance (Education), Secondary Education, Student Subcultures, *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the problems of education for disadvantaged urban minorities. Although the educational situation in the big cities is grim, a decade of study and experimentation should ready us for massive positive action. The educational system of the big cities is basically viable. An effective improvement program calls for: (1) developing appropriate systems of rewards for school achievement by children of various sub-cultures; (2) building a coherent, raticnal school program and curriculum that is understood and accepted by the pupil; (3) maintaining a pre-school program for disadvantaged children followed by a primary school program built upon it; (4) establishing a system of local community participation in school affairs in disadvantaged local communities; and, (5) developing a central school administration which relates the school system to other school and governmental systems in the metropolitan area. The alternative is to try to replace the present establishment in education with a chaos of small innovative enterprises of extremely uneven quality. [This paper was prepared for a book entitled "Urban Education in the 1970's," edited by A. Harry Passow, to be published by the Teachers College Press, Fall 1970.] (JM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Robert J. Havighurst
The University of Chicag
November, 1969

ED037498

PUBLIC EDUCATION FOR DISADVANTAGED URBAN MINORITIES*

When we look at what has happened in big city education since 1963 we see two contrasting pictures--both accurate.

On the one hand we see a set of massive, bureaucratic school systems responding ineffectually to the pressures of rapid social change in our cities. They are being criticised analytically by social scientists, venomously by anarchists, frantically by desperate parents, coldly by teachers unions, and passionately by young men and women who are just discovering that the world is a difficult place to live in.

On the other hand we see a growing number of research and development efforts, creative and solidly supported by systematic evaluation, which are building the base for an educational program that promises within the next decade to substantially eliminate the widespread educational retardation of children and youth in the big cities.

Inner city school problems are one large part of the "crisis of the cities," which is our domestic plague of the 1960s. This problem has very nearly demoralized some public school systems. Teachers and administrators who work at these problems are constantly criticised by a variety of public opinion makers and reflectors who announce:

The "demise of American public education;"

The "deterioration of New York's gigantic school system," (The New York Times editorial, November 9, 1967).

And then propose such drastic "reforms" as:

UD009965

*Opening lecture of a series sponsored by Teachers College, Columbia University, entitled Urban Education--Another Look.

Cutting up the big city school systems into smaller ones with varying degrees of autonomy;

Turning over the control of local schools to local neighborhood school boards composed of parents and citizens living in the neighborhood;

Dividing the big city school system into sub-systems operated and taught by minority group members for children of the same minority group;

Giving parents coupons good for cash payments which they can allot to private schools for their children;

Creating a school curriculum based mainly on the freely chosen activities of the pupils in an enriched school environment

The educational problem of the big cities is more complicated today than it was ten years ago, partly because the cities are worse off. At the same time, the situation is more favorable to a successful solution than it was ten years ago. The educational situation is more complicated because: the disadvantaged minority groups have demanded a voice in decision-making; the teachers' organizations have demanded a voice in determining educational policy and practice; and the professional educators and the educational "establishment" have been placed on the defensive.

The educational situation is more favorable because there is public concern, money for attacks on the problem, and some five years of recent active and imaginative experimentation with possible solutions.

There are two broad approaches to a solution for the educational problem. The one whose proponents attract the most attention would seek alternatives to the present public school system either through supporting a variety of private ventures which they hope will be more creative and more effective than the present system, or through breaking up the present structure of large bureaucratic administrative units into smaller units with a great deal of local autonomy, though they are still part of a public school system. The other approach appears more conservative.

It would work through the present public school leadership and structure to make basic and even radical changes which emerge from within the present system rather than being created outside the system and imposed upon it.

These two approaches will be examined critically in this paper. All the while, it should be kept in mind that we are discussing the problem of educating urban children who are economically disadvantaged. This does not imply that there are no other basic problems in present-day education. The writer believes that the broad changes in societal values which are now occurring present us with a basic educational problem which is significant for all segments of the population. But this paper is focussed on the education of the urban disadvantaged.

Who Are the Disadvantaged?

The first thing to say about the disadvantaged is that they are poor people. The disadvantaged, as we shall use the term, are the bottom 15 percent of the American population in terms of income and educational level. Their children, on the average, do poorly in school.

Poor people are found in practically all ethnic groups, but the highest proportions of the poor are found among Caucasians, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and American Indians. On the other hand, there are certain ethnic minorities whose children do very well--

as well or better than the national average--in school achievement. Outstanding among these are Japanese, Chinese, and Jews. The adults of these groups have an average occupational status and educational level above the national average.

There is no single ethnic group of any size that can be said to be disadvantaged educationally and economically as a total group. The Negroes might be thought of as a disadvantaged group, and this would be true, historically. But at present there is a large and growing Negro middle class and a large and growing Negro upper-working class, whose occupational status is average or above, and whose children do average or better work in school.

The same statement applies to Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and American Indians. It is the least educated and the least work-trained members of these group who do least well in American society. These groups all have substantial and growing numbers of people who perform at average or

higher levels of occupational status, and whose children do well in school

Thus, when we speak of the group of socially disadvantaged people in America, we are speaking of some 15 percent of the population who are like each other in their poverty, their lack of education and work skills, but unlike each other in ethnic sub-culture.

This group is to be found in rural as well as urban areas. If we make crude estimates on the distribution of the bottom 15 percent between metropolitan areas (cities of 50,000 or more and their surrounding counties) and small cities, towns and open country, we get Table 1.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF POOR PEOPLE, BY ETHNICITY (1970)

Ethnic Group	Metropolitan Areas	Small Cities, Towns and Open Country
	(in thousands)	
Caucasians (excluding Spanish Surname)	12,000	10,000
Negroes	4,000	4,000
Spanish-Americans	1,000	400
Puerto-Ricans	600	--
Indians	100	350
Total (approximate)	17,700	14,750

Note: These are estimates, based on recent family income data. The lowest 15 percent of the population (by income) is considered to be "poor," as of 1970.

In this paper we will call the children of these families "disadvantaged." We mean "economically disadvantaged," knowing that some children of rich families are emotionally disadvantaged, and that some children of poor families have rich and healthy emotional lives. Also, we know that a relatively small proportion of children in poor families have parents who are well-read and who give their children an excellent family base for success in school.

But there is a high statistical probability that a child raised in a poor family will get poor support for his cognitive development and will not be "ready" to learn to read when he is six years old. Therefore we describe the children of families of low income as a group that are disadvantaged for school success, on the average.

The people of Table 1 have poverty in common, and (with a few exceptions) they share what has come to be called the "culture of poverty." In addition, each group has its own ethnic culture or subculture. As we discuss the problem of improving the schooling of the children of these various groups, we must entertain the possibility that effective teaching should be different for the different ethnic groups, even though they have a "culture of poverty" in common.

In focussing on the "problem" of improved education for children of the poor it is important to avoid assessing <u>blame</u> for what is called "failure." Are the school systems "failing"? Are the children of the poor "failing"? Are the parents of these children "failing"?

Nothing could be more useless and frustrating than an attempt to distribute <u>blame</u> among these three groups. We need to make an accurate diagnosis of the disease which affects our big cities, and we need to avoid the "witch doctoring" which makes sensational newspaper copy and books with sensational titles but little substance in fact.

ATTACKS ON THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM

Granting that there is a profound educational problem, related to but not to be solved by solutions of the poverty problem, what are the educational programs for solution of this problem, and which ones are the most promising?

At the very beginning of discussion of this question we must face the fact of pervasive racial and economic segregation of the children in our school system.

We must grant that a viable solution of the educational problem for the long run must include integration of pupils of different racial and economic groups in the schools, for their entire period of schooling, or most of it. At the same time we must recognize that residential segregation patterns prevent an early achievement of this condition.

Therefore we should seek to achieve two goals as far as possible together. We should develop as many procedures as possible for integrating the schools. We should improve the quality of <u>teaching and learning</u> in the schools, no matter how they are constituted in terms of race and social class. We should strive to accomplish both objectives in the same schools as far as possible. We should recognize the possibility that progress on one front might interfere with progress on the other. That is, progress toward integration might slow up improvement of education in segregated schools, and this danger should be avoided.

We must also accept the proposition that the public educational system has the primary mission of <u>educating</u> all the children and youth up to the age of 16 and probably this mission will be extended to cover the remaining years up to age 20 for those young people who do not find acceptable

adult roles as workers or home-makers. Since the labor force has decreasing numbers of positions for unskilled workers, and for juveniles, the public school system will probably have to take responsibility for helping many young people to "grow up," who would have gotten unskilled jobs in earlier generations and grown up through the "school of hard knocks."

Thus the former function performed by the school system of "sorting out" young people for college, for high school graduation, and for early entry into the labor market has lost much of its validity. The public school system now must undertake to educate all youth, not to educate some and sort out the others. There will still be a sorting function, but it will be done within the school system by guiding youth into different avenues of schooling depending on their abilities and desires, up to a later age than was customary before 1950.

The attacks on the educational problem may be considered in two major categories.

I. Alternatives to the Public Schools

First is the use of public funds to support a system of educational activities that are separate from the official public school system. A number of proposals along this line have been urged by a variety of people. For instance, the Dean of the School of Education at Harvard University has proposed that parents be given a coupon for each school-age child which they can give to private schools attended by the children and which can be exchanged by the school for cash from the government. Quite a different proposal is made by some Catholic educators, for tuition scholarships paid by the public school system to inner-city disadvantaged pupils who will be accepted by Catholic schools within the limits set by a pattern of stable and viable racial and socioeconomic integration in a particular school.

The most detailed proposal for alternatives to the public schools has

been made by Kenneth B. Clark, a member of the Board of Regents of the State of New York. Professor Clark says he is convinced that the big city school systems will not do the job that is needed. He has lost faith in the public schools. Therefore he has proposed a set of six alternatives. These were contained in an address prepared by Professor Clark for delivery to the American Psychological Association in September 1969. (It is likely that Professor Clark thinks of these as experimental models from which the public schools might learn to change their patterns, but his rhetoric is not explicit on this point, and one can read his statement as though he thinks the public school system is incapable of making the reforms that are needed, and should be replaced by a system made up of these alternatives.)

It is useful to examine Professor Clark's six alternatives, to ask how far they would probably lead us toward a solution of the problem.

A. Regional schools financed by the state. A "regional" school presumably is one that serves several contiguous school districts, generally in a metropolitan area. This would presumably recruit students on a volunteer basis, with a balanced racial and socioeconomic composition. Arrangements would be made to transport most children to school by bus.

B. Regional schools financed by the federal government. This would presumably be similar to the state-financed school, but could serve pupils from two neighboring states and could be established in states that are unable or reluctant to maintain such schools at state expense.

C. Open schools operated by colleges and universities. Such schools would be laboratory-type schools, open to voluntary enrollment, and balanced in racial and socioeconomic terms. Presumably, these schools would be supported from public funds.

D. Open schools operated by industrial and business corporations. These would presumably be operated on contract with the school district or another governmental unit. There is a precedent in the form of Job Corps units operated on contract by business corporations.

E. Labor-union sponsored schools. These might give preference to children of union members, within limits imposed by the requirement of a racial and socio-economic balance. These would presumably be operated on contract with a governmental unit.

F. Schools for dropouts operated by the Department of Defense. These would be analogous to the present Project One Hundred Thousand, which has been accepting 100,000 young men a year who could not pass the earlier entrance standards under Selective Service, mainly for reasons of low educational achievement.

G. To this list might be added the proposal made by Professor Thomas Pettigrew of Harvard University for Metropolitan Educational Parks. These would be systems from kindergarten through high school with approximately 15,000 students, drawn from a metropolitan area on a voluntary basis and balanced racially and socio-economically. They would be operated by some kind of joint agency representing central city and suburban school districts, and the cost of the buildings would be met substantially by the federal government.

H. Another approach in this same general category has been proposed by Professor Donald Erickson of the Department of Education at the University of Chicago. He suggests that parents of school age children be given credits against their taxes if they wish to withdraw their children entirely or partially from the public school system. They might do one or more of the following:

(1) pay tuition for their children in private schools;

(2) pay tuition for a variety of specialized educational programs operated by other agencies, such as art museums, music and dancing schools, and travel agencies;

(3) pay tuition for intensive instruction in reading and/or arithmetic offered by private agencies which have specialized in designing and perfecting a single tightly built educational instrument.

These proposals are interesting and provocative. Most or perhaps all of them could well be operated as experimental or developmental projects from which the public school system might learn. But a little cool reflection brings to mind a host of difficulties that stand in the way of wholesale adoption of nearly all of these "alternatives." There are two major faults in this type of procedure.

First, the alternative educational programs and projects would draw selectively from the abler students and the more ambitious and well-informed families, of all economic levels, but especially from the middle classes. All projects which looked attractive would be over-subscribed, and the project operators would be under great inner pressure to pick the pupils most likely to do well, and to refuse admission to pupils who had any record of problem behavior. Thus the public school system would find itself trying to <u>educate</u> the great bulk of the population while the public-supported alternatives procedures were operated as selectors to sort out the most promising students.

If a drastic move was made to overcome this problem by simply closing the public school system and leaving the field wide open for the new educational ventures, there would be chaos, interesting to observe, but painful for families with children as well as for two million public school teachers. It might

take as much as 3 years to develop an orderly system of education, and this would probably only come about through the restoration of some kind of public-operated system.

This points to the second major fault of a program of alternatives to the public educational system if they are conceived as something more than research or developmental projects. Education must be conducted through a social institution in a big complex modern society. There are 50 million pupils in our schools, and more than 2 million school teachers. The enterprise of education is conducted by many thousand public school districts and many hundred private schools. These all operate under a set of laws and customs that have been years in the making. The people who want basic improvement in education must either work within the institution to modify and improve what we now have, or, if they are anti-institutionalists, they must work around the fringe of the educational system to create valuable innovations and leave it to the institution-builders to adopt and adapt the innovations.

It is desirable to develop some of these alternatives on an experimental basis, and this might be done with federal government support if the agencies now receiving government funds for educational innovation would pick up some of these ideas and work on them. As little as a third of the federal government funds now going into Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and into the support of Regional Educational Laboratories would be ample to pay for the development and evaluation of most of the alternatives which have been suggested. Leadership would have to be taken and the major operational decisions made by educators and legislators in state governments and state departments of education, and by the educators who make up the governing boards of the Regional Educational Laboratories. Few of the alternatives could be put into effect in a single school district alone.

II. Vigorous Internal Improvements in the Large City Public School Systems

This writer believes that the public school systems of the large cities are capable of making the drastic improvements that are needed for the education of disadvantaged urban children and youth. There are five elements in what might be an effective improvement program.

A. Develop Appropriate Systems of Rewards for School Achievement by Children of Various Sub-Cultures. The job of educating socially disadvantaged children will be done much better when educators understand more fully the nature of rewards and how they function in human learning, and apply this knowledge directly to their work with children and parents of socially disadvantaged children.*

In the years since 1960 a number of psychologists have studied the nature of rewards in human learning. Among others, the work of Zigler, Rotter, Katz, and Crandall have widened the field of research and have stilulated others to work in this field.

What these people have in common is the following proposition:

Human learning is influenced by a variety of rewards, which are themselves arranged in a culturally-based reward-punishment system which is learned.

This requires us to examine the nature of rewards. We cannot simply assume that "a reward is a reward and that is it," as we might be tempted to do if we were studying the learning behavior of cats, or pigeons, or

*This proposition has been developed more fully in Robert J. Havighurst, "Minority Sub-Cultures and the Law of Effect." American Psychologist, In Press, 1970.

rats. It was more or less obvious to researchers that reward systems might vary with social class, or with ethnic sub-culture. It seemed likely that a child learns his reward system mainly in the family, but also in the school and the peer group and the wider community.

On the basis of recent research on learning there appear to be four major types of reward-punishment which appear in an evolutionary sequence in the child. The earliest, in terms of operation in human learning, is satisfaction or deprivation of physiological appetites--the physiological needs for food and pain-avoidance. In this same category belong other material rewards which arise later in physiological development, either through the maturation of the organism or through experience--such rewards as release of sexual tensions, toys and play materials, money, and, perhaps, power over other people.

Next in order of appearance comes approval-disapproval from other persons, beginning with praise and reproof and expressions of affection and esteem from parents, and extending to approval-disapproval from others in the family and adults such as teachers, and from age-mates.

Next comes the self-rewarding and self-punishing action of the child's superego, or conscience. This is extremely important, from the point of view of educational development, because it means that the child who has reached this level can become capable of pushing ahead with his own education without being stimulated and directed by his parents or his teachers or his peers.

Finally comes the rewarding and punishing action of the ego, the executive function of the personality. This is more difficult to conceptualize as a source of reward or punishment. It is essential as a means of <u>anticipation</u> of future reward or punishment, success or failure, which will result as a consequence of an action performed now, in the present.

The following six propositions have received some research testing:

(1) Different sub-cultures carry their children along this evolutionary path at different rates and in different ways.

(2) There are differences between ethnic sub-cultures among disadvantaged groups in the reward systems they teach their children.

(3) In general, external rewards (material as well as intangible) have positive values for disadvantaged or failing children.

(4) An effective reward system in a complex changing society must be based on a strong Ego.

(5) A strongly developed Ego gives a sense of personal control and personal responsibility for important developments in one's life.

(6) People learn to operate at all the several levels of reward, by the time they reach adolescence; and the level at which they operate varies with the action area.

With this partially confirmed theory about the education of disadvantaged groups, we can say that teachers would teach more effectively if they: (1) used a great deal of praise and material rewards with disadvantaged children; and (2) put such order and consistency into the school setting that every child could see how to gain rewards for himself by making systematic efforts to learn in school.

B. Build a Coherent, Rational School Program and Curriculum that is Understood and Accepted by the Pupil.

When children do not learn well in school, we naturally ask ourselves whether there is something wrong with the curriculum or the way it is presented to the pupil. There are two contrasting answers to this question. One is that we adults are imposing a limited, rigid curriculum on children

and putting their minds in a strait-jacket. The other is that we do not present the curriculum in such a way that the child can understand what he is doing and where he is going.

The first view has had considerable play during the last few years, in a revival of the child-centered curriculum movement which was popular in the 1920s and 1930s. Among its persuasive presenters are John Holt and George Dennison, authors of books recently published. Holt, in his book,* How Children Learn, says "Only a few children in school ever become good at learning in the way we try to make them learn. Most of them get humiliated, frightened, and discouraged. They use their minds, not to learn, but to get out of doing the things we tell them to do--to make them learn. In the short run, these strategies seem to work. They make it possible for many children to get through their schooling even though they learn very little. But in the long run these strategies are self-limiting and self-defeating, and destroy both character and intelligence. The children who use such strategies are prevented by them from growing into more than limited versions of the human beings they might have become. This is the real failure that takes place in school, hardly any children escape. . . . . What is essential is to realize that children learn independently, not in bunches; that they learn out of interest and curiosity, not to please or appease the adults in power; and that they ought to be in control of their own learning, deciding for themselves what they want to learn and how they want to learn it."

---

*John Hold--How Children Learn. New York: Pitman Publishing Company. 1967

As expounded by Holt, this proposition seems to apply more to middle-class children than to the economically disadvantaged group. However, Herbert Kohl's 36 Children appears to present much the same kind of case, based on experience in a Harlem ghetto school

The contrasting view calls for more rather than less adult-created structure than the pupil generally gets today, but a structure which is carefully fitted to the student's present knowledge and to his motives. It aims to achieve "a real dialectic of authority and empathy in the classroom," which Donald Barr, Headmaster of the Dalton School, called for in his criticism of Holt's position.*

---

* Donald Barr, "The Works of John Holt," New York Times Book Review. Special Education Book Supplement. September 14, 1969.

The essential element is the pupil's perception of the connection between what he does in the classroom or in his school work and a result which he wants. When this condition is met, the pupil's ego can come into action to guide his effort and reward his success.

Programmed learning is an example, where it is used skilfully. The pupil accepts an assignment to learn a particular lesson or set of facts, and he is informed immediately of every successful step he takes toward this goal.

According to this view, the pupil must accept the notion that he has hard work to do which will require effort on his part in order to achieve the goal that he sees clearly.

Another example is the Mastery Program which Benjamin Bloom has helped to work out in schools in Puerto Rico and is now ready for general use. The work assignments are divided into relatively small units with frequent tests

for mastery. The pupil works for the mastery of his assignment, and keeps on working until he has demonstrated mastery. No matter how slow he is, compared with the rest of his class, he achieves mastery before going on to the next assignment. Bloom has found that the slow pupils move along much more rapidly than he had expected. Not only do pupils learn more effectively; they also come to enjoy learning. Bloom says,* "The clearest evidence of affective outcomes is the reported interest the student develops for the subject he has mastered. He begins to "like" the subject and to desire more of it. To do well in a subject opens up further avenues for exploration of the subject. Conversely, to do poorly in a subject closes an area for further study. The student desires some control over his environment, and mastery of a subject gives him some feeling of control over a part of his environment. Interest in a subject is both a result of mastery of the subject as well as a cause of mastery."

---

*Benjamin S. Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," Administrator's Notebook 16: No.8 April, 1968. Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago. See also B. S. Bloom, J. T. Hastings, and G. Madaus, Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

The successful innovative programs for high school age students also contain this element of motivation toward a clearly-understood goal. For example, the store-front academies that provide for high school dropouts a chance to prepare for the G.E.D. test which will give them the equivalent of a high school diploma, probably are successful because they work with young people who have become convinced that they need more education, and see clearly the connection between their study in the store-front academy and the achievement of this goal.

The Upward Bound and High Potential programs for disadvantaged high

school and college youth, where they are successful, seem to combine the element of motivation to succeed with a clearly-outlined program of study for a summer or a semester, which can be seen as a long step forward by the student.

C. Maintain a Pre-School Program for Disadvantaged Children Followed by a Primary School Program Built Upon It.

This procedure has now been tried and proven in eight or ten different school systems. Disadvantaged children who have had one or two full years of pre-school work have gained at least 10 IQ points, have moved into the first grade ready to learn to read, and have maintained this level of learning ability to the third grade. These experimental programs need another year or two of continued evaluation, but it can now be said responsibly that several alternative pre-school programs are available as models for city school systems to adopt and adapt.

At the same time it must be said that no big-city system has yet put a really effective pre-school program into effect. The country-wide evaluation of Head Start programs made by Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Ohio University in the Spring of 1969 showed that those programs on the average were not effective in helping children carry the gains made in Head Start on into the primary school grades.

Thus the big-city systems have this task yet to accomplish. They have federal government money available for substantial support of the program, and they have several successful experimental models to follow.

D. Establish a System of Local Community Participation in School Affairs in Disadvantaged Local Communities.

There has been an aggressive drive for greater participation and influence of poor and disadvantaged people in public education for the last 5 years. This is sometimes called decentralization, though local community influence is a more accurate term for it. President John H. Fischer of Teachers College at Columbia University argued recently that:*

> "We shall need a truly radical conception of decentralization, for what is involved is creating means by which principals and faculties can obtain from their communities far more regularly than they now do both their signals and their rewards.
>
> "One way to bring this about would be to establish in every school a group of parents and other citizens to work with the principal and teachers. . . (to) advise the school staff on educational priorities and objectives, on curriculum development and on the types of services most likely to aid the students. It could submit to the local board at least annually its appraisal of the school's success in meeting the problems the community considers important . . . ."

---

* Fischer, John H. "Fischer on Decentralization." Education News, August 5, 1968.

Major experiments in the increase of local community influence on school policy, personnel, and programs have been underway for two or three years in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville, Intermediate School 201, and Two Bridges communities of New York City, the Woodlawn community of Chicago, and elsewhere. Several of these experiments involve elected local school advisory boards, whose powers over the local schools are just now being worked out. Although serious mistakes have been made in some of these experiments, it is likely that we will profit from these mistakes so as to work out a system of local advisory boards who truly represent the local

parents and citizens and have learned how to communicate their needs and feelings to the school teachers and administrators.

E. Develop a Central School Administration which Relates The School System to Other School and Governmental Systems in the Metropolitan Area. What is most needed in big city school districts is quite different from the administrative decentralization which has become a shibboleth in some circles. In New York City it has been ordered that the large school district be divided into some 30 quasi-autonomous elementary school districts, each with its own school board and its own superintendent. This form of "decentralization" has a fascination for people who believe that bigness in itself is bad. But there is no evidence that school districts with 25,000 pupils are more innovative, more flexible, than a school district with several hundred thousand pupils. A danger in this form of decentralization is a tendency to create relatively homogeneous districts in terms of race and income, and thus to strengthen the forces for racial and economic segregation.

There are useful forms of administrative decentralization which delegate some decision-making power to regional or district superintendents who operate under a central administration and a single Board of Education. Thus, Chicago has three regional superintendents who have a good deal of autonomy under the central administration. Detroit has a degree of "home rule" by districts of about 35,000 pupils, each operating under the central school board and school administration. These seem to be working fairly well.

But the great need in terms of school system structure is for a single metropolitan area authority which finances the schools of the entire metropolita

area equitably, and brings the various local school systems together for area-wide planning and research into area-wide problems, and into cooperation on matters which they can handle better in common than individually.

The social and physical renewal of the cities should proceed with the fullest participation by the school system. The renewal of the cities should be a metropolitan area operation, since the central city and the suburbs are in continual interaction, and anything that happens to the central city affects the suburbs and vice versa.

There is no space here to develop and apply this proposition. The writer has done it fully in the 1970 edition of his Education in Metropolitan Areas.*

---

* Havighurst, Robert J. and Levine, Daniel U. Education in Metropolitan Areas. 2d Edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

Conclusion

In this discussion we have attempted to be realistic and positive. The educational situation in the big cities is grim--no doubt about it. But we have studied it and experimented with it for the better part of a decade, and we are now ready to take massive positive measures to improve it.

These positive measures must be based on careful study and on scientific evaluation. We cannot solve the problems of urban education without searching out the truth, and acting rationally on the basis of the truth. Numbers of people are trying to substitute emotion for reason in their sincere efforts to improve education. One can see the drive for "authenticity," "doing your thing," taking precedence in some people over the effort to find the truth and act rationally upon it.

Basic to the argument of this paper is the proposition that the educational system of the big cities is reasonably healthy and can respond effectively to the challenge of this complex urban situation. Strenuous efforts are necessary within this system, and men and women of devotion and drive are needed to make these efforts.

The alternative is to try to replace the present establishment in education with a chaos of small innovative enterprises--some good and some bad, uncoordinated and incoherent. Those who favor this alternative are either: frustrated individuals who see the present educational system as too rigid to change and have a naive faith that a new order will develop out of the needs of the situation as soon as valid new educative methods are discovered; or they are so hostile to the present social order that they favor "revolution for the hell of it" with the aim of tearing down the present social structure and making space for a new one to emerge after a period of revolution.

This paper has been focussed on the problems of education for disadvantaged urban minorities, but the problems of education for the relatively advantaged groups are fully as important and fully as complex, even though they are quite different. We are just at the beginning of a "culture of plenty" for which we are not well prepared in our societal values, our social institutions, and our individual life styles. The educational system will be more radically changed by its response to this situation than by its response to the poverty in our cities.